

Academic Senate - Agenda  
February 9, 1971

I. Call to order 3:00 p.m.

II. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 12, 1971

AS ESTABLISHED  
MSC (J. STUART) 10/10/70

III. Business Items

A. Personnel Policies Committee - H. Rhoads moved that

- \* The Academic Senate recommend to the President that the "Consultative Procedures in Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion," as submitted by the Personnel Policies Committee in its report dated January 29, 1971, be adopted as College policy. (See Attachment A, Agenda, February 9, 1971.) (MSC. H. Rhoads, Sec. W. Boyce)

91 FOR  
1 AGAINST  
QUESTION: 1 ABSTAIN

B. Special Committee on Enrollment Quotas - D. Stubbs moved that

(SEC. J. STUART)

A Committee of the Academic Senate review the appropriateness of the present enrollment quota projections and the methods used to produce them. This review should include recommendations on at least the following factors:

37 FOR  
3 AGAINST  
MSC 1 ABST.

- (1) Projected annual college growth including consideration of facilities, housing, etc.;
- (2) Projected distribution of college enrollment by school, including consideration of statewide and regional program offerings and employment opportunities;
- (3) Distribution of FTE faculty by school and student faculty ratio by school;
- (4) Projected levels of enrollment for the College in terms of lower division, upper division, and graduate;
- (5) Procedures for the implementation of enrollment quotas including consideration of changes of major.

Furthermore, it is resolved that this committee should propose a set of procedures by which the Academic Senate would review enrollment quota projections. These procedures should provide a time table, list who is responsible for conducting the review and specify minimum information and criteria that are to be used. (See Attachment B, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

C. Instruction Committee - J. Rogalla moved that

(SEC. SCALES)

MSC:

33 FOR  
11 AGAINST  
2 ABST.

The Academic Senate recommend to the President that the change of grade form include:

- (1) This statement: Responsibility for evaluating and reporting the performance of a student rests with the faculty member concerned. It is suggested that in considering a request for a change of grade the faculty member carefully evaluate the student's request within the framework of the integrity of the grading system and equity to the rest of the class, and
- (2) an additional copy be returned to the department in which the course was taught. (See Attachment C, Agenda, February 9, 1971.)

IV. Information Items

- A. Report of the Student Affairs Committee - W. Boyce (w/p. BANKS).  
B. Report of the Statewide Academic Senate - D. Grant

Comm. will meet FEB. 18, 1971

SENATE COMM  
2/10 BUS. AD.

WRITTEN REPORT WILL APPEAR IN NEXT CAL POLY REPORT

V. Announcements

- A. Identification badges have been provided by the Elections Committee for all Senators.  
B. Humanities 402, Human Values in Engineering, will be in the 1971-72 catalog. (See Attachment D, Agenda, February 11, 1971.)  
C. The Executive Committee elected Frank Coyes to fill the Senate vacancy created by the resignation of Dean Piper.  
D. President Kennedy will deliver his State of the College address to the Joint Assembly on February 16, 1971, at 3:15 p.m.  
E. Douglas Gerard desires that the Academic Senate be advised that the visitor parking areas on campus have not been eliminated.  
F. The Executive Committee directed the Chairman to appoint a Distinguished Teaching Award Committee authorized to act as similar committees have in the past.

VI. Adjournment. 4:30

C. REPORT OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL - J. STUART.

1. 2 YR CATALOGUE PLAN  
2. BUDGET - FULL UTILIZATION MATTER

CHECK CONSTITUENCY ON

1 1/2 HR CLASS VS 1 HR CLASS + SAT. USE

STATEWIDE SENATE APPROVED:

LIBR. BUDGETING APPROVED.  
(BOOK BUYING, ETC)

CHANCELLOR'S PLAN:

- THINK TO 6 YR INSTN OF  
THINK FACULTY LIMITED TO TEACHER MEMBERS  
THINK GRAD TO UPPER TWO MARKS ONLY

SENATE TOOK  
OBJECTION TO  
ALL 3 ISSUES

DRAFT

Personnel Policies Committee

Academic Senate

1/29/71

CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURES IN  
APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

Note: On 5/19/70 the Academic Senate provisionally approved Section I, below, pending completion of materials. Recommended changes since that date are underlined or crossed out.

I. Principles applicable to all consultation in personnel actions:

- A. Full and meaningful faculty participation shall be involved as defined in each procedure.
- B. Consultation shall be carried out with, and recommendations shall be made by, the lowest organizational unit practicable. Except where a clear disciplinary or other functional grouping occurs within a school or department, the lowest organizational unit would be the department. The department (or a school which does not have departments) shall decide whether to limit consultation to the discipline or functional grouping.
- C. When departments or other organizational units, whether because of newness, size, leaves of absence or other similar reasons, are inadequate to make personnel recommendations, they may be assisted by other appropriate faculty. The decision to augment such a unit should be made only after consultation with the unit and other appropriate faculty bodies.
- D. Recommendations and decisions shall be based only on professional competence, professional performance, and the educational needs of the specific department as well as of the College.
- E. Administrative recommendations and decisions normally should ~~be~~ ~~concur~~ concur, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, with the recommendations of the appropriate faculty unit or committee (specified in Section "B" above). When ~~however~~ administrative recommendations and decisions are contrary to the recommendations of the faculty unit, or when they result from a choice between conflicting committee recommendations, explanation of the reasons should be conveyed in writing to the committees or units consulted. All persons making personnel evaluations and recommendations should be made aware that their evaluations and recommendations are subject to review by the person evaluated, administrators with personnel evaluation responsibilities, the Personnel Review Committee of the local Academic Senate, and a Grievance Committee if the recommended action is appealed.



- F. Each department or other organizational unit shall develop, consistent with general college policy, its own written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. Both tenured and non-tenured members shall be involved in the development of this statement. Each departmental statement of criteria shall be approved by the President prior to implementation.
- G. A periodic review of the procedures and criteria shall be carried out by the department or unit at intervals to be determined by the department, but at least every three years. This review process shall include involvement of both tenured and non-tenured members.
- H. ~~Each department~~ A prospective departmental member shall be mailed or given a copy of the written statement of procedures and criteria, as soon as practicable prior to his appointment, not later than the initial offer of appointment.

## II. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES (Applicable to both full-time and part-time faculty appointments.)

### A. General Provisions

1. In the appointment of new faculty, every effort should be made to seek complete information and to evaluate thoroughly the backgrounds of individuals through such means as reference letters, telephone checks, personal interviews, etc. Whenever possible, it is desirable for the candidate to visit the campus and be interviewed by faculty members in his ~~teaching service area~~ discipline before an offer is made.
2. Every candidate for a faculty position, before being offered an appointment, shall be ~~fully~~ informed of current opportunities and limitations with respect to retention, tenure, promotion, and working conditions.
3. When a faculty member is appointed with certain specific stipulations which do not circumvent established rules and regulations and which will prevail in later decisions on reappointment and/or tenure, these stipulations shall be ~~made to him~~ included in ~~writing prior to his formal acceptance of the appointment~~, the letter of offer.
4. Individuals to be appointed shall be acceptable to the majority of the tenured faculty of the department concerned except under conditions outlined in Section I-C and I-E above.
5. As early as possible in the course of communications and discussions regarding a position, a prospective appointee shall be clearly informed as to: (a) which person or persons have the authority to extend an actual offer of appointment and (b) whether or not the communication constitutes an actual offer of a position.

## B. Special Provisions

It is recognized that because of the differences in the nature, size, or constitution of departments, a particular detailed procedure in the appointment process may not be appropriate for a given department. However, the departmental procedures should give consideration to the following questions:

1. Should a separate Appointment Committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations?
  - a. If so:
    - 1) Shall this committee consist of tenured faculty only?
    - 2) Shall there be non-tenured faculty on this committee?  
If yes, of what rank?
    - 3) Shall there be a student on this committee?
    - 4) Shall there be one or more faculty members from each discipline on this committee?
    - 5) Should the department head serve on this committee?
  - b. If not, what faculty members should be consulted?
2. The functions of the Appointment Committee or consulted group should be made explicit, such as:
  - a. Should the consulted group recommend which disciplines, areas, and/or options need academic personnel?
  - b. Should the consulted group screen all initial letters and applications and recommend which shall be followed up?
  - c. Should the consulted group try to estimate the prospective appointee's teaching ability through a formal presentation?
  - d. How should the recommendations of the consulted group be handled?

## III. REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

### A. General Procedures

1. Each probationary faculty member, full time or part time, shall be evaluated at least annually, in accordance with the established timetable, by appropriate faculty and administrative personnel guided by the consultative principles expressed in Section I above. In the evaluative and consultative processes ~~at the department level~~, appropriate faculty should include tenured faculty members in the same discipline, organizational unit, or department and appropriate administrative personnel should include the department head or his equivalent.

2. The results of the consultative evaluation stated with reasonable particularity in summary, signed by the committee chairmen or the committee members, or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the department head to the dean. Such statements shall include ~~reliable evidence which will~~ reasons in sufficient detail to validate recommendations of the consulted group and the department head.
3. Following each evaluation, the person evaluated shall be promptly informed by his department head of his apparent strengths, weaknesses, and prospects for future career in the department or school as indicated by the evaluation.
4. ~~No faculty member shall~~ Faculty members to be reappointed ~~who~~ ~~is not~~ shall be acceptable to a majority of the tenured faculty of the department or organizational unit concerned except under the conditions expressed in Section I-C and I-E above.
5. All committees and administrators, other than the President, who review and make recommendations on reappointment or termination of a full-time faculty member shall be required to forward reasons, in writing, for their recommendation. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
6. If a termination recommendation is made by the department head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If a termination recommendation is made first by the dean or division head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for termination shall take place prior to review by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
7. Notification of non-reappointment shall be in writing in conformity with dates and procedures established in Title V, California Administrative Code. Although the President or his designee ~~may~~ is not required to routinely give written reasons for termination of non-tenured faculty, the faculty member may request, and shall receive, from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his termination.
8. Changes in criteria for reappointment shall not apply retroactively.

B. Special Provisions

It is recognized that, because of differences in the nature, size, or constitution of departments, a particular detailed procedure in the reappointment process may not be appropriate for a given department. However, the departmental procedures should give consideration to the following questions:

1. Should a separate Reappointment Committee be charged with responsibility?

a. If so:

1) What functions should the Committee have?

a) Evaluation of professional and teaching performance, research and creative activities, contributions to the institution and community, appropriate academic training or experience to perform the required duties? (Evidence for evaluation could include class visitation, review of course outlines, tests, publications, and documents submitted by the person being evaluated. Peer opinion, alumni opinion, student opinion, and statements by the person being evaluated regarding his performance in any significant area could also be considered.)

b) Recommendation of reappointment or termination to appropriate administrators and committees?

2) How shall the Committee be constituted?

a) Shall only tenured faculty of the same department and discipline be included?

b) Shall non-tenured members be included? If so, what rank?

c) Shall faculty members in the same department, but in another discipline, be included?

d) Shall there be a student on the Committee?

e) Shall the department head serve on this Committee?

b. If not, what faculty members should be consulted?

2. Additional questions for consideration:

a. Should a resume of experience and accomplishments be required or requested from a faculty member being considered for reappointment?

b. Should the evaluation statement by the initiating committee be provided directly to the faculty member upon request?



#### IV. TENURE PROCEDURES

##### A. General Procedures

1. Each faculty member eligible for tenure consideration shall be evaluated by his department head and the tenured members of his department according to established college-wide deadlines and consistent with the consultative procedures expressed in Section I above.
2. Responsibilities of all parties in the evaluation process include the following:
  - a. Faculty members being considered for tenure shall submit a resume of experience and accomplishments, giving valid reasons why tenure should be accorded, to those involved in the evaluation process. Such a statement may include a summary of activities, professional meetings, additional education, committee work, community relations, administrative duties and similar matters which will be considered in the evaluation. resume shall become a part of the faculty member's personnel file.
  - b. ~~Each tenured~~ Tenured faculty ~~member~~ members and the department head shall, as a professional responsibility, make an effort to ~~observe~~ evaluate the professional competence and performance of ~~his~~ their non-tenured colleagues so that ~~he~~ they may assist, constructively, the evaluation process.
3. The results of the consultative evaluation, stated with reasonable particularity in summary, signed by the committee chairman or the committee members, or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the department head to the dean. Such statements shall include reliable evidence which will reasons in sufficient detail to validate recommendations of the consulted group and the department head.
4. ~~No faculty member shall~~ Faculty members to be accorded tenure who ~~is not~~ shall be acceptable to a majority of the tenured faculty of the department or organizational unit concerned except under the conditions expressed in Sections I-C and I-E above.
5. Normally, tenure should not be granted in the case of a candidate who does not hold the appropriate terminal degree in his field of specialty from an accredited institution. Normally, the terminal degree in the field of specialty from an accredited institution or equivalent attainment shall be the desirable qualification for tenure. Equivalent attainment is accepted: (a) in those fields where the doctorate is not common, and (b) in vocational fields where experience may be substituted for academic training. Exception to this rule should be made only where a candidate shows exceptional competence and performance in teaching or other outstanding service to the academic community.



6. All committees and administrators other than the President who review and make recommendations on tenure shall forward reasons, in writing, for their recommendation. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
7. If the recommendation of non-tenure is made by the department head he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If the recommendation of non-tenure is made first by the dean, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for non-tenure shall take place prior to review of the case by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
8. Notification of non-tenure shall be in writing in conformity with dates and procedures established in Title 5, California Administrative Code. Although the President or his designee is not required to ~~may not~~ routinely give written reasons for non-tenure, a faculty member may request and shall receive from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his non-tenure.
9. Changes in criteria for tenured appointment shall not apply retroactively.

B. Special Provisions

Individual departments (or schools not having departments) should consider the following questions and incorporate the decisions in their written procedures:

1. What other individuals should be consulted in the evaluation process?
  - a. Non-tenured colleagues?
  - b. One or more students on an advanced level?
  - c. Faculty members in other disciplines?
  - d. Alumni?
2. Should a separate tenure committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations? If so:
  - a. Should it receive and consider written recommendations from the individuals determined in B-1?
  - b. Should it report its recommendations back to the individuals determined in B-1?
  - c. How should they be appointed?

3. What additional functions should the tenure committee or consulted group have?
  - a. Are there particular evaluation methods that should be used?
  - b. How shall their recommendations be presented?

## V. PROMOTION PROCEDURES

### A. General Provisions

1. Evaluation and associated consultation for promotion shall be carried out during the academic year prior to the first date of eligibility for promotion and in each subsequent year if not promoted.
2. The basic evaluation, for promotion, of the professional competence and performance in terms of the educational needs of the Department and the College shall be made by the individual's tenured colleagues of higher rank and the department head in accordance with the provisions of Section I above.
3. Faculty members eligible for promotion shall submit a resume or supplementary statement of experience and accomplishments which demonstrates evidence of promotability to those involved in the evaluation process. Such a resume or statement shall become a part of the faculty member's personnel file.
4. Consultation should be carried out with specific reference to approved criteria and standards developed and written down by the department and appropriate to the level of promotion. These criteria should be specific as to the following: (a) for which level of promotion the doctorate or other recognized terminal degree is a normal prerequisite and what exceptions may be applied and (b) whether promotion in rank may or may not occur prior to tenure and, if not, what exceptions may be applied.
5. The results of the consultative evaluation, stated with reasonable particularity in summary, signed by the committee chairman or the committee members, or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the department head to the dean. Such statements shall include ~~reliable evidence which will~~ reasons in sufficient detail to validate the recommendations of the consulted group and the department head.
6. The recommendations of the department head normally should be in conformity with the recommendations of the faculty unit or committee consulted. If this is not the case, full explanation of the reasons for a contrary recommendation should be conveyed to the faculty unit or committee consulted, as well as the individual involved.

7. All committees and administrators other than the President who review promotion shall be required to forward reasons, in writing, for their recommendations. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
8. If the recommendation of non-promotion is made by the department head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If the recommendation of non-promotion is made first by the dean or division head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for non-promotion recommendations shall take place prior to review by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
9. Although the President or his designee ~~may~~ is not required to routinely give written reasons for non-promotion, the faculty member may request and shall receive, from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his non-promotion.

#### B. Special Provisions

Individual departments (or schools not having departments) should consider the following questions and incorporate the decisions in their written procedures:

1. What other individuals should be consulted in the promotional process?
  - a. Non-tenured colleagues?
  - b. One or more students on an advanced level?
  - c. Faculty members in other disciplines?
  - d. Alumni?
2. Should a separate promotion committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations? If so:
  - a. Should it receive and consider written recommendations from the individuals determined in B-1?
  - b. Should it report its recommendations back to the individuals determined in B-1?
  - c. How should they be appointed?
3. What additional functions should the promotion committee or consulted group have?
  - a. Are there particular evaluation methods that should be used?
  - b. How shall their recommendations be presented?

## Report of the Academic Senate Special Committee on Enrollment Quotas

D. F. Stubbs, Chairman

L.H. Dunigan, J.S. Stuart, J.E. Simmons, D.J. Price

This committee was asked to produce a brief report "...which will explain the procedure used in determining each (enrollment) quota figure and the rationale used."

The committee members discussed enrollment quotas with faculty members, several school deans, members of the administrative staff, and with President Kennedy. During these discussions, many factors affecting enrollment quotas were considered. Among them were: employment opportunities for graduates, polytechnic emphasis, facilities, faculty, budget, variables such as the student continuing rate from one year to the next, and the type of student that is applying to Cal Poly.

The first four sections of this report attempt to describe as concisely as possible who determines each quota figure and what we understand to be the most important criteria used. What we did not attempt to include was a judgment of the merit of current enrollment projections or the criteria used to produce them. Consequently, we have included in Section V an outline of what we feel remains to be done in order to complete the Academic Senate study of enrollment quotas. In our opinion, this study should be conducted by a committee consisting of at least one Academic Senator from each school.

### I. Legal Basis for Enrollment Quotas

The trustees have authorized the Chancellor to establish enrollment quotas for any of the following categories: academic area, class level, program and student residence status.<sup>1</sup>

The Chancellor has, in turn, directed each college president to propose enrollment quotas in any or all of the categories specified by the trustees.<sup>2</sup> As a minimum, it is required that enrollment quotas be proposed for lower division, upper division, graduate, EOP and foreign student programs (see Appendix C). All proposed enrollment quotas must be submitted to the Chancellor's office for review and approval.

The primary reason for the enrollment categories required by the Chancellor is to insure the accommodation of California community college transfers.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to the enrollment categories required by the Chancellor, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, specifies an enrollment quota for each major.

### II. Enrollment Quota for the College

At Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, the college enrollment quota is proposed annually by the president. For 1971-72, President Kennedy proposed and the Chancellor approved



no enrollment growth as compared with 1970-71. Beginning with 1972-73, President Kennedy anticipates proposing a growth rate of approximately 500 FTE students per year until the target enrollment of 15,700 is reached in 1980.<sup>3</sup>

These projected enrollment growths are based primarily on:<sup>4</sup>

1. Limiting enrollment growth to an amount which can be effectively administered.
2. Projected growth of campus facilities.<sup>5</sup>
3. Projected growth of student and faculty housing.<sup>6</sup>

The college annual growth rate is reviewed annually by the President's Council, the Academic Council, and the Academic Senate.<sup>8</sup> At the present time, this review process does not follow a set of written procedures.

### III. Enrollment Quotas for Schools within the College

For several years prior to 1970-71 school enrollment quotas were proposed by the Academic Council subject to presidential review.<sup>7</sup> Starting in the fall of 1970, this procedure was changed and now the enrollment quotas by school originate with the president rather than the Academic Council.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to enrollment quotas by school for 1971-72, President Kennedy has established long-range enrollment quotas by school through 1980-81. These quotas, which are attached as Appendix A, show three main types of data for each instructional school: (A) fall majors, (B) annual FTE taught, (C) FTE faculty. The procedure used to construct this table was the following:

1. A growth increment of 500 FTE per year for the college was chosen as discussed in Part II of this report. The resulting college totals of Annual FTE Taught in Part B of the table were then converted to college totals of estimated Fall Majors in Part A of the table (fall majors about 104% of annual FTE).
2. A long-range percentage mix of fall majors by school for 1980-81 was decided upon in Part A. This distribution included consideration of the following guidelines:
  - a. To emphasize the polytechnic character of the college by maintaining strong programs in Agriculture, Engineering, Architecture, Business, and Home Economics.
  - b. To emphasize programs not generally available in other state colleges including those within the schools of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, and Engineering and Technology, as well as similar specific programs within other schools such as Graphic Communications, Biochemistry, Computer Science, Child Development, and Statistics.

3. The current percentage mix of fall majors by school was gradually shifted by year to reach the target mix by 1975-76, and the percentages were converted to numbers of fall majors for each school for each year in Part A.
4. The numbers of fall majors by school and year in Part A were converted to estimated numbers of annual FTE taught by school and year in Part B, based on historical ratios of annual FTE taught to fall majors by school as shown in Part D, and by past trends in FTE taught by school as a percent of the college total as shown in Part B (see Appendix B).
5. FTE faculty in each school were estimated in Part C by using the Student-Faculty Ratios resulting from the 1971-72 Faculty Staffing Formula Worksheets as divided into the annual FTE taught by school from Part B.
6. The fall majors estimated by school in Part A of the table may be used to determine the number of new students to be enrolled by school after the estimated continuing and returning students are subtracted for a given year.

#### IV. Quotas by Major within Each School

After enrollment quotas by school are determined, each school dean proposes enrollment quotas by major within his school. These quotas are determined by the school dean in consultation with the appropriate department heads and are subject to review and approval by the president.

#### V. Recommendations

- A. Resolved that a committee of the Academic Senate review the appropriateness of the present enrollment quota projections and the methods used to produce them. This review should include recommendations on at least the following factors.
  1. projected annual college growth rate including consideration of facilities, housing, etc. (see Appendix A and paragraph II above)
  2. projected distribution of college enrollment by school, including consideration of statewide and regional program offerings and employment opportunities (see Appendix A and paragraph III above).
  3. distribution of FTE faculty by school and student faculty ratio by school (see Appendix A and paragraph II above).
  4. projected levels of enrollment for the college in terms of Lower Division, Upper Division, and Graduate (see Appendix C and paragraph I above).
  5. procedures for the implementation of enrollment quotas including consideration of changes of major.<sup>8</sup>

- B. Furthermore, it is resolved that this committee should propose a set of procedures by which the Academic Senate would review enrollment quota projections. These procedures should provide a time table, list who is responsible for conducting the review and specify minimum information and criteria that are to be considered.

- 1 Title 5, California Administrative Code, Section 40650, Enrollment Quotas.
- 2 Office of the Chancellor, Enrollment Quotas and Determination of Priority, Executive Order Number 110.
- 3 Guidelines for Planned Enrollment Growth, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, Annual FTE Taught, and FTE Faculty, by School, 1970-71 to 1980-81, R. E. Kennedy, October 2, 1970 (see Appendix A).
- 4 Meeting of the Academic Senate Committee on Enrollment Quotas with President Kennedy, December 1, 1970.
- 5 Graph of Annual FTE Enrollment and Plant Capacity, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, Actual 1960-61 to 1969-70; Projected to 1976-77, L. H. Dunigan, July 29, 1970.
- 6 Comparison of San Luis Obispo City Housing Starts with Fall Enrollment Increments at Cal Poly, L. H. Dunigan, October 9, 1970.
- 7 Administrative Bulletin 70-02, Policy and Procedures for Enrollment Quotas, February 1, 1970.
- 8 Draft Revision of AB 70-02, Policy and Procedures for Enrollment Quotas, L. H. Dunigan, December 3, 1970.

**GUIDELINES FOR PLANNED ENROLLMENT GROWTH, CAL POLY, SAN LUIS OBISPO, FALL MAJORS, ANNUAL FTE TAUGHT,  
AND FTE FACULTY, BY SCHOOL, 1970-71 to 1980-81**

APPENDIX A

Attachment I

Schools	1970-71		1971-72		1972-73		1973-74		1974-75		1975-76		1980-81	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>A. Fall Majors</b>	<b>Registration</b>													
1. Ag. & Nat. Res.	2,392	19.3	2,392	19.3	2,450	19.4	2,565	19.7	2,708	20.0	2,812	20.0	3,271	20.0
2. Arch & Env.Des.	1,402	11.3	1,402	11.3	1,427	11.3	1,562	12.0	1,760	13.0	1,969	14.0	2,290	14.0
3. Bus. & Soc.Sci.	1,501	12.1	1,501	12.1	1,528	12.1	1,562	12.0	1,625	12.0	1,687	12.0	1,962	12.0
4. Comm.Arts & Hum.	932	7.5	932	7.5	998	7.9	1,042	8.0	1,083	8.0	1,125	8.0	1,308	8.0
5. Engr. & Tech.	2,583	20.9	2,583	20.9	2,640	20.9	2,669	20.5	2,708	20.0	2,812	20.0	3,271	20.0
6. Hum.Dev. & Ed.	2,112	17.1	2,112	17.1	2,109	16.7	2,110	16.2	2,112	15.6	2,109	15.0	2,453	15.0
7. Science & Math.	1,451	11.7	1,451	11.7	1,478	11.7	1,510	11.6	1,544	11.4	1,547	11.0	1,799	11.0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>12,373</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>12,373</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>12,630</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>13,020</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>13,540</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>14,061</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>16,354</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>B. Annual FTE Taught</b>	<b>Estimated</b>													
1. Ag. & Nat. Res.	1,206	10.3	1,206	10.3	1,236	10.3	1,293	10.3	1,365	10.5	1,417	10.5	1,648	10.5
2. Arch & Env.Des.	807	6.9	807	6.9	813	6.8	890	7.1	986	7.6	1,103	8.2	1,282	8.2
3. Bus. & Soc.Sci.	1,486	12.7	1,486	12.7	1,524	12.7	1,562	12.5	1,625	12.5	1,687	12.5	1,962	12.5
4. Comm.Arts & Hum.	2,375	20.3	2,375	20.3	2,451	20.4	2,627	21.0	2,730	21.0	2,836	21.0	3,293	21.0
5. Engr. & Tech.	1,345	11.5	1,345	11.5	1,380	11.5	1,401	11.2	1,422	10.9	1,476	10.9	1,717	10.9
6. Hum.Dev. & Ed.	1,415	12.1	1,415	12.1	1,452	12.1	1,477	11.8	1,534	11.8	1,580	11.7	1,840	11.7
7. Science & Math.	3,066	26.2	3,066	26.2	3,144	26.2	3,250	26.0	3,338	25.7	3,401	25.2	3,958	25.2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11,700</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>11,700</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>12,500</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>13,000</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>15,700</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>C. FTE Faculty (SFR)</b>														
1. Ag. & Nat.Res. (12.7)	95.0	13.1	95.0	13.1	97.3	13.1	101.8	13.1	107.5	13.3	111.6	13.2	129.8	13.2
2. Arch & Env.Des. (9.3)	86.8	12.0	86.8	12.0	87.4	11.8	95.7	12.3	106.0	13.1	118.6	14.0	137.8	14.0
3. Bus. & Soc.Sci. (23.1)	64.3	8.9	64.3	8.9	66.0	8.9	67.6	8.7	70.3	8.7	73.0	8.7	84.9	8.7
4. Comm.Arts & Hum. (21.2)	112.0	15.4	112.0	15.4	115.6	15.6	123.9	16.0	128.8	15.9	133.8	15.8	155.3	15.8
5. Engr. & Tech. (11.9)	113.0	15.6	113.0	15.6	116.0	15.6	117.7	15.2	119.5	14.8	124.0	14.7	144.3	14.7
6. Hum.Dev. & Ed. (15.8)	89.6	12.3	89.6	12.3	91.9	12.3	93.5	12.1	97.1	12.0	100.0	11.8	116.4	11.9
7. Science & Math. (18.6)	164.8	22.7	164.8	22.7	169.0	22.7	174.7	22.5	179.5	22.2	182.8	21.7	212.8	21.7
<b>Totals</b>	<b>725.5</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>725.5</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>743.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>774.9</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>808.7</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>843.8</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>981.3</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>D. Percent: Annual FTE Taught of Fall Majors</b>														
1. Ag. & Nat. Res.	50.4		50.4		50.4		50.4		50.4		50.4		50.4	
2. Arch & Env. Des.	57.6		57.6		57.0		57.0		56.0		56.0		56.0	
3. Bus. & Soc.Sci.	99.0		99.0		99.7		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	
4. Comm.Arts & Hum.	254.8		254.8		245.6		252.1		252.1		252.1		251.8	
5. Engr. & Tech.	52.1		52.1		52.3		52.5		52.5		52.5		52.5	
6. Hum. Dev. & Ed.	67.0		67.0		68.8		70.0		72.6		74.9		75.0	
7. Science & Math.	211.3		211.3		212.7		215.2		216.2		219.8		220.0	
<b>College</b>	<b>94.6</b>		<b>94.6</b>		<b>95.0</b>		<b>96.0</b>		<b>96.0</b>		<b>96.0</b>		<b>96.0</b>	



ENROLLMENT OF FALL MAJORS AND ANNUAL FTE TAUGHT IN SCHOOL,  
CAL POLY, SLO, 1960-61 TO 1970-71

APPENDIX B

Attachment II

Schools	1960-61		1965-66		1966-67		1967-68		1968-69		1969-70		Registration 1970-71	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>A. Fall Majors</b>														
Ag. & Nat. Res.	1,230	26.1	1,544	22.8	1,674	21.6	1,732	20.7	1,864	19.2	2,070	18.4	2,392	19.3
Arch & Env. Des.	356	7.6	705	9.8	818	10.6	931	11.1	1,281	13.2	1,413	12.5	1,402	11.3
Bus. & Soc. Sci.	305	6.5	1,027	14.2	1,118	14.4	1,218	14.6	1,320	13.6	1,538	13.6	1,501	12.2
Comm. Arts & Hum.	182	3.9	454	6.2	493	6.4	505	6.0	620	6.4	894	7.9	932	7.5
Engr. & Tech.	1,539	32.6	1,681	23.3	1,765	22.8	1,800	21.5	1,987	20.5	2,268	20.1	2,583	20.9
Hum. Dev. & Ed.	713	15.1	1,025	14.2	1,108	14.3	1,331	15.9	1,669	17.2	1,892	16.8	2,112	17.1
Science & Math.	374	7.9	689	9.5	764	9.9	853	10.2	970	10.0	1,204	10.7	1,451	11.7
Unknown	14	0.3	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Totals	4,713	100.0	7,225	100.0	7,740	100.0	8,370	100.0	9,711	100.1	11,279	100.0	12,373	99.9
<b>B. Annual FTE Taught</b>														
													<u>Estimated</u>	
Ag. & Nat. Res.			918	13.5	942	12.6	949	11.7	997	10.7	1,087	10.1	1,206	10.3
Arch & Env. Des.			359	5.3	433	5.8	520	6.4	702	7.6	793	7.4	807	6.9
Bus. & Soc. Sci.			879	12.9	978	13.1	1,027	12.7	1,207	13.0	1,412	13.2	1,486	12.7
Comm. Arts & Hum.			1,311	19.2	1,436	19.2	1,536	18.9	1,825	19.6	2,180	20.4	2,375	20.3
Engr. & Tech.			844	12.4	910	12.2	953	11.8	1,040	11.2	1,194	11.2	1,345	11.3
Hum. Dev. & Ed.			671	9.8	794	10.6	1,015	12.5	1,164	12.5	1,323	12.4	1,415	12.1
Science & Math.			1,835	26.9	1,976	26.5	2,111	26.0	2,356	25.4	2,701	25.3	3,066	26.2
Totals			6,817	100.0	7,469	100.0	8,111	100.0	9,291	100.0	10,682	100.0	11,700	100.0
<b>C. Percent: Annual FTE Taught of Fall Majors</b>														
													<u>Estimated</u>	
Ag. & Nat. Res.			55.8		56.3		54.8		53.5		52.1		50.4	
Arch & Env. Des.			50.9		53.0		55.8		54.8		56.1		57.6	
Bus. & Soc. Sci.			85.6		87.5		84.3		91.4		91.8		99.0	
Comm. Arts & Hum.			288.8		291.3		304.2		294.4		243.8		254.8	
Engr. & Tech.			50.2		51.5		52.9		52.3		52.6		52.1	
Hum. Dev. & Ed.			65.5		71.7		76.3		69.7		69.9		67.0	
Science & Math.			266.3		258.6		247.5		242.9		224.3		211.3	
College			94.4		96.5		96.9		95.7		94.7		94.6	

## Memorandum

To : ~~William~~ M. Alexander, Chairman  
Academic Senate

Date : January 22, 1971

File No.:

From : Robert E. Kennedy

Copies : Clucas, Cummins,  
Ericson, Higdon,  
D. Head, J. Mott,  
Cook, Andrews

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution

I approve the Academic Senate Resolution of January 12, 1971, which rescinds approval of the course Engineering 402 and pledges its support to the School of Engineering and Technology in its attempt to satisfy accrediting agency requirements for an additional three units of study in the area of humanities and social sciences.

I agree with the substance of your interpretation of the second part of the resolution, but see no reason why the process cannot be expedited. It is my judgment that the concept of developing a special course for engineering majors to receive humanities-social sciences content has already been approved. Furthermore, my discussions with those most directly involved indicate that the concept of such a course is not now an issue. Therefore, I am directing Mr. Cook to include in the 1971-72 catalog the course Humanities 402, Human Values in Engineering. The course description, for catalog purposes, can be the same as it was when approved as "Engineering 402." Any subsequent change in course outline and catalog description can be reflected in subsequent catalogs, etc.

I have directed Deans Clucas, Cummins, Ericson, and Higdon to delegate to an appropriate interdisciplinary committee responsibility for developing the course outline to be taught as an interdisciplinary course with FTE credit appropriately divided.

RECEIVED  
JAN 27 1971

HEAD OFFICE - 1900 UNIVERSITY  
CA - 93401